



Minutes of the Annual General Meeting

of the

Association for Project Management

Held on Tuesday 21st November 2017

at

Princes Gate Heritage Room,

30 Euston Square, London NW1 2FB

Commencing at 10.30 am

Association for Project Management
Ibis House
Regent Park, Summerleys Road
Princes Risborough
Buckinghamshire
HP27 9LE

Association for Project Management is incorporated by Royal Charter RC000890 and a registered charity No. 1171112.

Chairman of the meeting: Miles Shepherd,

Present: 30 full members were present, as detailed on the attendance list

In attendance: The Chief Executive, Company Secretary and others were in attendance.

Opening of the meeting

The Chairman of the meeting opened the meeting and explained that he was acting as Chairman in the absence of David Waboso, the President, who was unable to attend and sent his apologies.

The Chairman of the meeting introduced those on the top table with him – the Chairman of the Board, the Chief Executive and the Company Secretary.

In addition to the apology received from the President, apologies were received from Sue Kershaw and Merv Wyeth.

The Chairman of the meeting asked members to note that distributed on chairs for attendees were copies of the:

- Notice of meeting setting out the agenda
- Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the company held on 21 November 2016
- Full annual report and accounts of the company for the year ended 31st March 2017
- Member Review summary for 2016/2017
- Written answers to the written questions posed prior to the meeting

1. President's address

The Chairman of the meeting read the President's address, which had been provided by the President for the meeting. A copy is attached as Appendix 1.

2. Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of the company held on 21st November 2016

The minutes of the previous Annual General meeting were approved and signed by the Chairman of this meeting.

3. Receipt of the annual accounts of the company Association for Project Management for the year ended 31st March 2017, the report of the trustees and the auditors' report

The Chairman of the meeting invited the Chief Executive and the Chairman of the Board to present to the meeting on the annual report and accounts for 2016/17, the achievements of the year, strategy and forward plans.

The Chief Executive opened the presentation. She explained that 2016-17 had been a year in transition, with APM receiving its Royal Charter in December 2016 and transitioning to a Chartered body in April 2017. Her presentation went on to give summaries for the financial year of:

- Financial activity and results
- Sources of income
- Membership figures and growth
- Qualifications taken
- Expenditure

The presentation went on to cover key achievements in 2016-17, extracts from the member review and activity with APM volunteers including re-accreditation by Investors in Volunteers in February 2017. Finally the presentation covered the Charter timeline, noting that:

- the consultation on the Chartered standard proposals was now complete and had received over 120 responses
- it was intended to publish the final standard and a short report on consultation feedback within the next two weeks
- it was intended to open the Register for applications in Spring 2018

The Chairman of the Board then presented on APM's strategy. He spoke about the approach taken by the Board and the work undertaken. He then went on to explain APM's vision, mission and five key objectives.

The Chief Executive then presented on the plans looking forward to implement the strategy and steps being taken to achieve the objectives.

The Chief Executive thanked the Board, the volunteers and the staff team for all their work in attaining the significant achievements in the year.

A copy of the PowerPoint slides used in the presentation will be available with these minutes.

The meeting noted that the annual accounts, report of the trustees and auditors report had been duly received.

4. The APM election

The Company Secretary reported the results of the 2017 Board election as follows:

- There had been ten candidates for four vacancies on the Board (three vacancies for a term of three years and one vacancy for a term of one year)
- Turnout had been 17.7% which continued recent upper quartile performance
- Growth in online votes had continued

The Company Secretary reported that this year two challenges had been raised by two candidates about activity relating to the election. The Company Secretary had consulted with Electoral Reform Services, the independent scrutineers of the election, and both had concluded that the matters complained of could not have realistically affected the outcome of the election. As a consequence, the result would stand. He outlined the proxy voting system utilised for the AGM to affirm the results.

The result of the election was as follows:

| Candidate | Votes | |
|------------------|-------|---------|
| Ranjit SIDHU | 1631 | ELECTED |
| Alistair GODBOLD | 1001 | ELECTED |
| Brian WERNHAM | 990 | ELECTED |
| Roy MILLARD | 895 | ELECTED |
| Neil RUNCIMAN | 710 | |
| Paul MAIR | 675 | |
| Adrian PYNE | 667 | |
| Neil COCHLIN | 649 | |
| Nick JOHNS | 491 | |
| Phil WHILEY | 411 | |

Ranjit Sidhu, Alistair Godbold and Brian Wernham were therefore elected to the Board for a period of three years and Roy Millard for a period of one year.

5. Members' questions

The Chairman of the meeting expressed thanks for so many questions and remarked that it was good to see accountability alive and kicking. He reminded the meeting that answers to the written questions submitted had been provided on chairs and that they would be published with the minutes in the normal way. He explained that he would turn the pages and briefly summarise the questions and answers. He stated that he expected the high standards of behaviour and courtesy expected of an APM member to be maintained.

The Chairman of the Board read the statement attached as Appendix 2.

The Chairman of the meeting then turned the pages of the printed questions and answers and summarised each as he went through. He asked if anyone wanted to comment. No comments or further questions were made to the meeting or received. The questions raised and answers given are attached at Appendix 3.

The Chairman of the meeting then made closing remarks.

The Chairman of the Board also made closing remarks, expressing thanks to the Board members (and particularly to those leaving the Board), thanks to the Chief Executive and the executive team and thanks to the Company Secretary for his diligent work in providing support services to the Board and during the election. Finally, he welcomed Ranjit Sidhu as a new member of the Board and the returning Board members Alistair Godbold, Brian Wernham and Roy Millard.

The meeting closed at 11.33am.

Chairman _____

Appendix 1 – President's address

2016 proved to be historic year for APM. One which was dominated by the achievement of becoming a Chartered body. This comprised two parts:

- Receiving Royal Charter status in the middle of the period;
- Transitioning APM to the new legal entity by the end of the financial year.

Obviously work has continued apace beyond the year covered by the AGM but it is important to recognise further milestones:

- Developing and consulting on the proposed standard, and
- Initiating the work on the processes which will underpin the Register of project professionals to launch next year.

Getting Chartered status is a significant achievement. But it is a platform on which we must build.

Creating a chartered profession will have relevance in three very specific ways:

- First, it helps build public confidence and trust in the project professional i.e. individuals like you.
- Secondly, it helps provide coherence in building and acknowledging excellence in individual skills and abilities – not least in keeping up with the techniques and methods relevant for tomorrow's challenges.
- Finally, and just as important - it is about **improving the delivery of real world benefits and outcomes** through projects for the **benefit of the general public**.

All of you will take different things out of the opportunity of Chartered but for me I believe it helps us **promote the profession better and allow wider access to the next generation of project managers...**

...and will provide a clear pathway for new talent - and switchers from other careers paths as well – to diversity and broaden the profession.

To give but one example – it will be possible for an apprentice doing project management to see Chartered as an aspiration as they develop their career path.

I know that the Chief Executive and Chairman will cover this momentous year in more detail in a moment as well as addressing the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead, but I just wanted to thank all of you here today, and indeed those not present today, who have volunteered their time and energy - both in helping to achieve the Charter award and the continuing work to embed it – and crucially also supporting the business as usual activity that keeps the show the road!

We have the opportunity to build a profession with the knowledge, competence **and particularly professional behaviours** that demonstrate that becoming a real profession is within our grasp. Let's take that opportunity.

Thank you.

That is the conclusion of the President's statement.

Appendix 2 – The statement of the Chairman of the Board

There has been some limited comment online and in emails which has been provocative, unhelpful and inaccurate. In the main, it has focussed on the issue Miles mentioned. I would like to make the following clear:

- First, the Board has been required to make some difficult decisions. It has done so very carefully, with the best of advice and in the best interests of the Association. I am proud of the professional way this has been handled by the Board and its staff and advisers. The Board refutes completely that there has been any improper decision making or motives.
- APM deeply regrets that certain allegations have been made. The need to consider those allegations are the reason why we are in this most unfortunate position. The allegations absolutely had to be investigated and considered carefully and they have been. Not doing so would have been a failure of Board leadership and governance.
- The Board has not, cannot and will not release the detail of the issue beyond what is in these written answers. Essentially, the Board has taken a decision it was required and entitled to make. This has been confirmed by an independent review of the steps taken by our external audit firm, Kingston Smith.
- I remind all present of the need to protect the confidentiality of Board proceedings and not to prejudice an ongoing Code of Professional Conduct Procedure. I repeat that the Association expects its members to engage on this issue in a professional and courteous manner.
- I must also report that a judicial review proceeding has been issued against APM by Mr Brian Wernham. Our statement on this is as follows: *We are disappointed to learn that Mr Wernham has chosen to issue a claim for judicial review against APM. Mr Wernham has been informed, on numerous occasions, that his complaints are entirely without foundation. APM conducts itself with the utmost propriety and this claim, which will be robustly defended, is an unwelcome diversion from the primary focus of the charity. APM will take legal advice and deal with the claim as appropriate, however our primary focus will, as it always is, be on the business of APM and our charitable objectives.*

Appendix 3

Association for Project Management - AGM 2017 – Questions Received and Answers

The following questions were received by the deadline and are listed in the order of receipt.

Question 1 – David Shannon

Since achievement of Chartered status, what is the current strategy in relation to APM's international opportunities? In particular will this change our involvement with IPMA?

The Board have refreshed the strategy for APM which reflects the recent transition of APM to be the Chartered body for the project profession. APM's vision, mission and 5 key objectives are published on the APM website. The international dimension permeates all that APM does, in the same way as diversity. Therefore APM's international strategy is designed to be integrated with APM's 5 key objectives. These are:

- **Chartered standard:** Successfully position, develop and launch the Chartered standard to become the accepted benchmark standard for project professionals.
- **Membership growth:** Increase the public understanding of how project management drives successful project delivery. Accelerate the growth, diversity and global reach of APM's membership by engaging with new sectors and communities.
- **Knowledge and research:** Further develop, with academic and corporate partner support, an innovative knowledge and research programme which adds value to the profession.
- **Collaborate and engage:** Accelerate the universal adoption of project management by people delivering change through collaboration and partnerships.
- **Organisational innovation:** Define and build APM as the model of a sustainable professional body for the 21st century

APM's current international activities include the following:

APM continues to engage fully with the International Project Management Association (IPMA). As a continuing member of IPMA, we are represented on the Council of Delegates (CoD) by Alistair Godbold (a member of the Board who is standing for re-election). He attends all the meetings of CoD and meets delegates from other member associations. He has also been actively involved in other IPMA groups furthering the work of IPMA. Nick Johns acts as APM's substitute representative to the IPMA CoD and maintains contact with representatives of other member associations with interests common to those of APM.

Alan Macklin (a Deputy Chair of the Board) is an active member of IPMA's Certification Validation Management Board (CVMB) and has been nominated by APM to continue in that role in the coming year. CVMB carries out important work to manage the maintenance and development of the IPMA Certification System. APM has in 2017 also been providing secretariat support services to the CVMB on a paid basis.

APM is represented on the Board of the Global Alliance for the Project Professions (GAPPS) by David Preece (formerly Naval Communications Portfolio Director, Defence & Government, with Thales). GAPPS

is a unique international alliance of government, industry, professional associations, national qualification bodies and training/academic institutions. APM were delighted to join London South Bank University in hosting the 38th GAPPS Thought Leadership Forum in London earlier this year. We express thanks to David Preece and those at London South Bank University for their work in enabling this to happen.

APM's International Licensing Officer explores and where appropriate develops opportunities for APM in the international arena with national member associations of IPMA and a wide range of other organisations. Recently APM has been in discussion with representatives of the Hong Kong Government on matters of mutual interest. We will continue to look for opportunities to co-operate with other associations within the family of IPMA and others internationally in the fields of research, supporting materials and qualifications and assessments. We intend to continue to engage widely with sister associations such as PMI and others to discuss areas of mutual interest.

APM will continue to explore international opportunities as they occur in the light of these 5 key objectives and pursue them where they support the objectives.

APM is the UK Member Association of the International Project Management Association and has had involvement with IPMA over a period of many years. The current strategy does not propose any change in APM membership of IPMA and APM continues to engage with IPMA on matters of common interest.

Question 2 – David Shannon

In view of our substantial financial contribution to IPMA have we sufficient confidence in the quality of its planning, monitoring and control of expenditure?

Please see the answer to the question above about our support for IPMA.

As a member of IPMA, APM is represented on IPMA's Council of Delegates (CoD). The CoD meets twice yearly. At the CoD meeting in September 2017 it was agreed to establish a Finance Committee and external auditors were appointed in respect of the 2017 accounts. Both these actions may help throw further light on this area. APM will continue to keep such matters under review.

Question 3 – David Shannon

Did three Board members resign during the last year and why?

Yes. Steve Wake resigned on 12 May 2017. Brian Wernham resigned on 18 September 2017 and Simon Taylor resigned on 29 September 2017. It is for the members rather than APM to provide any further information should they be willing to do so.

Question 4 – David Shannon

Regarding the ineligibility of one candidate to stand for the election to the Board as reported on the APM website, was this concluded by the company secretary as required under Appendix 3 g of our Regulations? The commentary on the website seems to indicate that the Board made this decision, if so under what regulation?

The statement on the website is copied below for context. The Company Secretary is responsible for scrutinising the eligibility of candidates (as per para 3g of Appendix 3 of the Regulations). On identifying the issue, he escalated it to the Board for decision.



The Board are responsible for managing the business of APM (this is confirmed in clause 15 of the bye-laws to the Royal Charter and also in the Regulations). The decision taken by the Board was in accordance with the overriding legal duty on the trustees to act in the best interests of the charity. Legal advice on this issue was sought and followed.

APM Statement on 2017 Board elections

APM is aware that a number of statements have been posted on social media and potentially elsewhere concerning the APM Board elections. The election, administered by Electoral Reform Services, was launched as scheduled on 10 October and the voting remains open until midnight on 10 November. Voting APM members are encouraged to take part at this exciting time for our Association. Details are available online at www.ersvotes.com/apm2017

The APM Board continues to acts in the best interests of APM and takes its role and accountabilities very seriously. Having taken legal advice, it has carefully considered a question raised in relation to the validity of an individual's candidature. The Board has concluded, with regret, that one individual cannot be considered eligible for the ballot at this time. This arises from a serious incident report having been issued to the Charity Commission and which is currently pending the resolution of a Code of Professional Conduct procedure. We are unable to make any further comment on the specific nature of the report to avoid prejudicing the fairness of the ongoing procedure and in light of APM's obligations relating to confidentiality. The decision to refer the matter to the Charity Commission was endorsed by both our legal and other professional advisors following careful consideration by APM.

APM considers that a number of statements that have been made in relation to the above incident, by a very small number of members, are inaccurate. APM respectfully requests that APM members consider their comments carefully to ensure they remain within the high standards of ethical behaviour expected of a Chartered body and in accordance with the APM Code of Professional Conduct.

Question 5 – David Shannon

Please confirm that the board is now without a chairman until one is elected at the November meeting following this AGM, as per Regulation 6.3.

Regulation 6.3 states that the Board will elect one of its members to be chair annually at the November meeting and at any other time if a vacancy occurs. The Chair was elected to that role by the Board in November 2016 for the period through to the start of the November 2017 Board meeting. The first item at that meeting is to elect a chair.

Question 6 – David Shannon

What has been the percentage rate of growth of the individual membership over each of the last five years?

| APM individual members 2012-2017 | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| As at 31 March | No.of members | Increase in members (No.) | Increase in members (%) |
| 2012 | 19,713 | | |
| 2013 | 20,546 | 833 | 4.2% |
| 2014 | 21,150 | 604 | 2.9% |
| 2015 | 21,650 | 500 | 2.4% |
| 2016 | 22,356 | 706 | 3.3% |
| 2017 | 23,000 | 644 | 2.9% |

Question 7 – David Shannon

Would the board consider raising the number of members required by By-law 28 to initiate a general meeting above the number 25? This low threshold may lead to too numerous frivolous general meetings.

The current number is low. As a benchmark, the default Companies Act requirement is 5% of voting members. For APM that would be c700. The matter can be reviewed by the Board when the time is right to consider an update to the Charter. Approval of a change to the Charter would be a matter for the Privy Council, following approval of the change at a general meeting.

Question 8 – Tom Taylor

During the (extended) period to secure Chartered status the relationship between APM and representatives of HM Government – including the Cabinet Office, Treasury, supporting Ministries and Privy Council – had to be strict and proper – including for APM senior parties, staff, advisors and the general membership. And quite right to. Could APM please provide directions and guidance on such relationships, communications and engagements for the present and going forward? Thank you.

Now we have achieved Chartered status we still retain a relationship with the Privy Council (now domiciled within the Cabinet Office) as the standards owner for all Royal charter bodies.

However, we have an active engagement programme across all parts of government in two different senses. First, they are a dominant membership group within APM and it is important this relationship is carefully maintained through the Commercial team. But on a wider influencing front we speak to various parts of government on issues of relevance to APM; skills development like apprenticeships and T levels; the Industrial strategy and broader issues pertaining to professionalism, standards and project management.

It is worth noting that we have a very active relationship with the IPA – the part of Government responsible for project management across government – and they have provided some excellent feedback to the Chartered consultation and have been very encouraging and supportive of the benefits of a Chartered profession.

Question 9 – Tom Taylor

With the growth of employee numbers in Business Development and Marketing as noted on page 38 of the Annual Report and Accounts 2016-17 and related activities; and the status of being a Chartered body; are there any plans to consider the need for accommodation and facilities with a London address at some time in the future? And how may this operate? And in any other urban centres? Thank you.

Most Chartered bodies have a large office in London and many have been trying to relocate parts of their staffing out of London for cost reasons to move from major legacy offices. One major professional body has just sold their office (complete with livery hall) to the Corporation of London. So the APM has the luxury of having a low cost model and the ability to evolve our office space as we adapt for our strategic plan cycle to 2022. We are experimenting for a year with a small office facility in London, mostly for external affairs\Commercial activities and we will review this utility of this next year. Princes Risborough capacity is constantly reviewed.

Question 10 – Graham Hawkins

Is the threat posed to APM's Qualifications Portfolio and Membership offerings by Generation Z/Millennials joining the profession, leading to a reduction in take up of APM's products, on APM's Strategic Risk Register?

APM is fully aware of the need to provide products and value propositions not only for the millennials and generation Z, but also for the need of the wider profession. The risk is on the strategic risk register and there are a number of areas of work that will address these risks, including establishing career paths through to Chartered, developing Apprenticeships in Project Management and broadening the offering from APM. In addition, APM will be keeping our qualifications and assessments methods under review to ensure we are up to date with current methodologies which meet the expectations of future generations.

Question 11 – Graham Hawkins

How does APM propose to bring the qualifications offerings, in particular PMQ and PPQ, in line with the new paradigm (where information/knowledge is freely available on the internet), to meet the demands of this growing demographic and 21st century way of working, whilst at the same time maintaining standards?

PMQ is currently APM's IPMA Level D certificate so needs to continue to meet the regulatory requirements. With regards to PPQ, a review of this qualification is planned in 2018, primarily in relation to the assessment method, as opposed to the content.

Information is freely available, however, the value of qualifications and quality assured external assessment is not diminishing and overall qualification numbers continue to rise. The outcomes of any qualifications review need to ensure the quality assurance and standards are strong

Question 12 – Merv Wyeth

Individual Member Numbers: Relative contribution to £1.2m shortfall in annual income

The Chief Executive's report in APM 2016/17 Accounts states that individual membership has grown steadily to 23,000. APM scorecard Customer KPI shows that 4,538 new members joined in the financial year, exceeding target of 4,166.

However, the Financial KPI shows that APM actual turnover for 2016/17 was £9.2m, well below its £10.4m growth target owing to reduced income from; membership, qualifications and sponsorship.

I note that free student membership was introduced this year. Please share how many members there are at; student, associate, member and fellow grades, along with the target and actual numbers of new members for each for 2016/17?

The table below shows member numbers at 31 March 2017 and new members for the year, both actual and budget. Despite new members being higher than budgeted, income was below for two reasons. The starting number of members was below that budgeted (the budgeted is prepared and approved prior to year-end). In addition, the mix of new members, although higher than budgeted in total, had a larger proportion of members paying a lower subscription. Free student membership was introduced in February 2017 and had a negligible impact on subscription income for the year.

Individual member numbers

| | Actual | | Budget | | Variance | |
|-----------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|
| | As at 31 | | As at 31 | | As at 31 | |
| | New | March 2017 | New | March 2017 | New | March 2017 |
| Full | 1,490 | 13,759 | 2,463 | 13,639 | (973) | 120 |
| Associate | 2,269 | 7,416 | 1,384 | 7,662 | 885 | (246) |
| Student | 712 | 1,304 | 57 | 320 | 655 | 984 |
| Fellow | 57 | 348 | 130 | 720 | (73) | (372) |

Question 13 – Merv Wyeth

In addition, please identify the amounts by which each of the 3 income categories are below target, and their relative contribution to the £1.2m shortfall, i.e. membership = £x,000s, qualifications = £y,000s and sponsorship = £z,000s. What does APM propose to do about this in the coming year?

The shortfall of actual income over budgeted includes membership subscription income, both corporate and individual (£284k), qualifications (£523k) and sponsorship (£112k).

It should be noted that the respective increases on the prior year were £182k (5%), £310k (8%) contributing to an overall increase in income of 9%. Sponsorship was down on the previous year by £23k (38%). APM will continue to maintain a strong commercial focus on top line growth.

2016 -17 Financial year Income variance to budget and previous year's actuals analysis

£000's

| | Actual | Budget | Variance | | Previous year's actuals | Variance | |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|----------|--------|-------------------------|----------|---------|
| | | | £ | % | | £ | % |
| Qualifications | 4,137 | 4,660 | (523) | (11%) | 3,827 | 310 | 8% |
| PMQ | 2,711 | 2,929 | (218) | (7%) | 2,385 | 326 | 14% |
| PPQ | 3 | 138 | (135) | (98%) | 0 | 3 | #DIV/0! |
| PQ | 140 | 203 | (63) | (31%) | 166 | (26) | (16%) |
| RPP | 142 | 201 | (59) | (29%) | 137 | 5 | 4% |
| PFQ | 988 | 1,005 | (17) | (2%) | 986 | 2 | 0% |
| Others | 153 | 184 | (31) | (17%) | 153 | 0 | - |
| Accreditation | 327 | 324 | 3 | 1% | 294 | 33 | 11% |
| Membership | 3,622 | 3,906 | (284) | (7%) | 3,440 | 182 | 5% |
| Individual Membership | 3,064 | 3,329 | (265) | (8%) | 2,980 | 84 | 3% |
| Corporate Subscriptions | 558 | 577 | (19) | (3%) | 460 | 98 | 21% |
| Sponsorship | 38 | 150 | (112) | (75%) | 61 | (23) | (38%) |
| Events - APM | 462 | 581 | (119) | (20%) | 235 | 227 | 97% |
| Events - Branch and SIG | 91 | 126 | (35) | (28%) | 122 | (31) | (25%) |
| Annual Awards Ceremony | 176 | 228 | (52) | (23%) | 228 | (52) | (23%) |
| Scottish Conference | 19 | 46 | (27) | (59%) | - | 19 | #DIV/0! |
| Northern Conference | 30 | 53 | (23) | (43%) | - | 30 | #DIV/0! |
| APM presents | 0 | 15 | (15) | (100%) | 6 | (6) | (100%) |
| Annual Conference | 173 | 160 | 13 | 8% | 1 | 172 | 17,200% |
| WIPM | 63 | 46 | 17 | 37% | - | 63 | #DIV/0! |
| Head Office | 37 | 69 | (32) | (46%) | 31 | 6 | 19% |
| Publishing | 367 | 299 | 68 | 23% | 338 | 29 | 9% |
| Project magazine | 41 | 60 | (19) | (32%) | 39 | 2 | 5% |
| Other | 114 | 187 | (73) | (39%) | 81 | 33 | 41% |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Actual income | 9,236 | 10,362 |
| Question 14 – Merv Wyeth | (1,126) | (11%) |
| | 8,468 | 768 |
| | | 9% |

Question 14 – Merv Wyeth

Volunteers Sub-Strategy: What can volunteers expect to see, and when?

At the Volunteers Forum in Leeds, Sept. 2017 John McGlynn gave a presentation in which he identified 11 different 'Supporting Sub-Strategies,' including the Voluntary Strategy [listed at 9, not alphabetical] that are intended to accompany the 'new' APM strategy.

No target dates were provided for the publication of these sub-strategies, which should provide an additional level of detail for volunteer groups, such as SIGs and Branches, to align and optimise their contribution to executing APM strategy.

I note that the Volunteer's Project in Projectplace contains a draft presentation, entitled APM Volunteer Strategy, Simon Taylor version 42, uploaded Oct. 2016 – but then the trail appears to go cold. A process that in fact started more than two years ago seems to have stalled and, despite repeated requests, no further information has been made available.

When does APM plan to publish a Volunteer Sub-Strategy and what opportunities will there be for volunteers to participate in the drafting / development process?

First, since the Board agreed and published the new strategy, in September the board further agreed to have 11 sub strategies to underpin the main strategy. One of these was to be on volunteering – i.e. this is defined as wider than 'volunteers' activity (primarily branches and SIGs). These are board-owned documents. The board will consider these in batches and the volunteering one – currently being drafted – is likely to be considered in the New Year, depending on agenda priorities. It is worth noting that this goes wider than volunteer activity and will link to the other sub-strategies, for example: knowledge; the new digital strategy; research, and engagement with schools and colleges (14-19 strategy) all of which will require support in some degree from volunteers.

Secondly, the VSG remit is to align the efforts of the volunteer communities and to strengthen the bond between the strategy and the volunteers and has representatives from the volunteer community including Eileen Roden, Russel Jamieson, Ben Pinches and Mike Ward. It has been considering issues like rewards and recognition; undertaken the review for business planning for SIGs and branches (undertaken this month) and considering how alternative network might emerge.

One of the early Chartered discussion papers was on volunteering and set out a number of ideas for broadening the opportunity for volunteering.

The VSG is chaired by a member of the board (Simon Taylor), who resigned a couple of months ago. The new board will choose his successor but the VSG continues to meet and will feed into the volunteering sub -strategy at a draft stage. Anyone who has thoughts on priorities or ideas are welcome to feed these via the VSG. The VSG having had a wide-ranging discussion about the volunteering strategy at its meeting in October and assisted the APM team in formulating ideas for this process.

Question 15 – Jim Dale

Individual Membership Numbers. A small growth, to 23,000, is reported in individual APM membership numbers. Meanwhile the popularity of project qualifications delivered by other bodies remains unabated. At the same time fellow professional organisations continue to attain growth levels of a higher magnitude than the APM. During the last twenty-five years, while being associated with the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD), I have witnessed a growth in individual membership of more than 500% to just over 140,000 individual members. This has been achieved by a prolific increase in student members as a consequence of their strategy of working with HEIs (Higher Education Institutes) to deliver degree and diploma courses linked to the CIPD membership requirements. Last year 16,000 students joined the CIPD. Why are the APM not following a similar model to achieve a growth in individual membership?

Without doubt project management is a growing profession and with the advent of chartered status, APM is poised to capitalise on this growth. There are five key priorities for membership growth:

1. International membership. APM currently has 1,400 members living and working outside the UK.

2. Leveraging the current training provider network as a channel to market for membership as well as APM qualifications, both in the UK and internationally. In the last 4 quarters, there are over 10,000 APM qualification takers who have not become members.
3. Conversion of student members to associate members. Student membership was made free in February 2017. This has swelled student numbers to just under 3,000, providing a significant pipeline for the future.
4. Continuous improvement of the membership value proposition to ensure access to world class knowledge, events, resources, career support, professional development and networking. Associate membership is open to anyone with an interest in project management.
5. Ease of use improvements in the application and payment process. Increase the uptake of payments by direct debit from 18% to 50% and direct new full members to join as associate members first

Question 16 – Jim Dale

Why are the APM continuing to invest in qualifications, such as the PPQ and work in apparent isolation, when these qualifications could be delivered by HEIs as part of a recognised diploma or degree course?

As the Chartered body for the project profession, it is important that APM can support the growth of project management and help address skills shortages. One aspect of this is to have a strong career framework and a number of routes to achieving Chartered status. One of these routes is via professional qualifications offered by APM, hence developments of qualifications such as PPQ. However, APM is also developing a recognised assessment route to achieving Chartered Status, which will enable broader access to the profession by recognising qualifications and other assessments, such as degrees. In addition, APM is involved in the development of the recently approved project manager integrated degree apprenticeship.

Question 17 – Jim Dale

Why are the APM failing to achieve the growth in membership attained by bodies such as the CIPD?

APM is a member of PARN (Professional Associations Research Network) and regularly shares best practice with similar membership organisations. The challenge as always for professional bodies is to stay relevant and offer value in an increasingly digital world, where information is freely available. APM very much aspires to be the voice and home of the profession and currently reaches a community of over 90,000. Membership growth is one of APM's strategic objectives and is a key focus and priority. The introduction of free student membership has been an important step forward in securing opportunities for future growth but there is still much work to be done. See the five focus areas for growth above.

Question 18 – Jim Dale

Why are the Board apparently reluctant to set ambitious targets for membership expansion that aligns with the rapid and continuing popularity of project management?

Many factors are taken into account when targets are set. Membership growth remains a key focus and priority and there is no doubt that the Board will continue to set a target that is challenging but achievable.

Question 19 – Brian Wernham

Is there a complaints process for use in elections? Is there an appeals process?

There is no formal process for complaints or appeals but any complaints that are raised will be considered. For example, in this election, two candidates independently submitted challenges to the Company Secretary. The Company Secretary took advice from the Association's independent scrutineers, Electoral Reform Services. In the event of a substantive issue, matters would be escalated to the Board of trustees.

Question 20 – Brian Wernham

On the 18th September 2017 the Board invited the current Chair, John McGlynn, to be Chair for next term of the Board from 21st November. Is extending such an invitation within the powers of the present Board which dissolves on that date?

Individual trustees' appointment terms change but there is no 'dissolution' of the Board. The September meeting of the Board has made a formal recommendation to the 21 November 2017 meeting of the Board that it elect John McGlynn as Chair for a further year. It will be for the Board to elect the chair at their meeting in November. Making such a recommendation is within the powers of the Board. The Board also agreed to appoint John McGlynn as a trustee for a further year and his term of office now runs to the conclusion of the AGM in November 2018. An extract from the Board's published summary of the September 2017 Board meeting is copied below for context.

Extract from September 2017 Board meeting summary: Building on a recommendation from the external board evaluation consultants, and to provide for succession planning, the Board agreed to invite John McGlynn (in his absence) to serve as an appointed Board member for one year from November 2017. Further, there was a unanimous recommendation to the November Board meeting that John be appointed as Chairman for a further year to ensure continuity during a critical period and leadership for the discussion and implementation of further governance recommendations. Note: Board members with conflicts of interest did not take part in the decision.

Question 21 – Brian Wernham

[Question updated to remove confidential personal details]

On the 10th October 2017 an individual, did not appear in the list of candidates for the 2017 elections for Trustee Board Members. The APM was founded in 1972. In the previous 45 years of elections to the Board (and previously the Council), has this or a similar procedure ever been used before? Can you confirm whether the candidate submitted the proper nomination papers on time and was qualified to be nominated?

The current Company Secretary is aware of an instance where a nomination was submitted by an associate member who, following scrutiny in accordance with the Regulations, was deemed ineligible and the nomination did not proceed. Similar situations are likely to have occurred in the past.

There is no other known instance of the Board deciding that a candidate was ineligible to proceed to the ballot due to a continuing Code of Professional Conduct Procedure and from the need to issue a serious incident report to the Charity Commission.

Question 22 – Brian Wernham

[Question updated to remove confidential personal details]

Can you confirm whether the candidate submitted the proper nomination papers on time and was qualified to be nominated?

The candidate submitted a properly completed nomination form on time. The following usual eligibility checks were passed:

- The candidate was a member
- The candidate's proposer and seconder were members
- The candidate was not disqualified as a company director or a charity trustee.

Question 23 – Brian Wernham

What was the process by which his name was removed?

On receipt of the nomination, the Company Secretary scrutinised the application for eligibility in accordance with the Regulations and informed the Chair and the Chief Executive. Legal advice was sought as to the Board's duties, obligations and options. The Chair informed the Board and canvassed views. At that point, two other Board members exercised their right under the Regulations to require the Company Secretary to call a special meeting of the Board. The meeting was held and considered the issue in great detail. Legal advice had been sought and was part of the consideration. In light of the ongoing Code of Professional Conduct investigation, the Board resolved that the candidate should be invited to voluntarily withdraw from the ballot. If the candidate chose not to do so, the Board agreed that the candidate was not eligible to proceed to the ballot at this time, pending the resolution of the Code of Professional Conduct procedure. The candidate was informed of the decision. There was no response and Electoral Reform Services were asked to withdraw the candidate's details from the election material.

Question 24 – Brian Wernham

[Question updated to remove confidential personal details]

Was a procedure followed by which either of the candidate's sponsors were asked to withdraw their nominations after the candidate's papers had been lodged and the deadline had passed?

No. The candidate's seconder independently withdrew their name from the nomination. Despite the deadline having passed, an alternative seconder was sourced and accepted. The candidate remained on the ballot at that point and this was not a factor in the decision that they were ineligible to stand in the election.

Question 25 – Jon Broome

With regard to the face-to-face Extraordinary Board Meeting of 16th June 2017, called on the basis of an alleged criminal offence and serious fraud, what was the full cost of this (a) to the APM directly in terms of expenses paid (b) in term of staff hours used to prepare for and attend it and (c) the estimated opportunity cost to volunteer board members e.g. lost consultancy hours for independents, salaries paid for by employers etc.?

The characterisation of the basis of the meeting is inaccurate. APM is unable to divulge the nature of the issues discussed other than to confirm it resulted in the decision to issue a serious incident report to the Charity Commission and the continuing Code of Professional Conduct procedure.

Expenses claimed by Board members for the 16 June 2017 Board meeting totalled £374.10. Trustees have a voluntary role and they are entitled to be paid their expenses incurred in undertaking their role as a charity trustee.

There is no direct cost to APM from staff salaries as these are paid regardless of what meetings are attended and preparations undertaken. The Chief Executive and Company Secretary were involved and advising on such issues is an essential element of their role. There is no time recording facility to accurately calculate the opportunity cost of preparing for and attending the meeting.

No data is available on the opportunity costs of trustees' time. Trustees undertake the role in an unpaid and voluntary capacity knowing that they will be called upon to attend meetings. This is an important part of their fiduciary role to the charity.

Question 26 – Jon Broome

Given the cost of the Extraordinary Board Meeting, do board members consider it a good use of the Association's money for a mix-up over expenses of £51.35p ? Surely other lower key, less extreme and proportionate actions would have been much more appropriate?

APM does not recognise the characterisation of the issue as set out in the question. The APM statement already made (see question 4) confirms that APM considers that a number of statements that have been made in relation to the incident, by a very small number of members, are inaccurate. APM is not at liberty to divulge the detail of the issue because, amongst other reasons, it is bound to protect the confidentiality of the parties involved and because it seeks to avoid prejudicing the ongoing process.

The actions taken have been given extremely careful consideration and made on the basis of professional advice. The Board has been required to reach a series of difficult decisions in relation to the matter. It is satisfied that its response has been reasonable, proportionate and appropriate and based upon the available information.

Question 27 – Jon Broome

The APM notified the Charities Commission of a 'serious incident' report this year. What was the date and exact wording of this report?

The serious incident report was notified to the Charity Commission on 26 June 2017. Its contents are confidential.

Question 28 – Jon Broome

Given that the Charities Commission definition of a 'serious incident' is one which "suggests dishonesty or fraud involving a significant loss of, or a material risk to, charitable funds or assets", can the board explain why they notified a mix-up over expenses for £51.35p to the Charities Commission ? And if it did not relate to this, why was this notification publicised – see <https://www.apm.org.uk/about-us/how-apm-is-run/apm-board/board-election> as a reason for barring the individual concerned from seeking election to the board ?

Again, the question does not include all of the facts or context of the situation.

APM made every effort to protect the reputation of the Association and the candidate by keeping the matter confidential. The APM statement (see question 4 above) was made solely as a response to the inaccurate reporting of the matter on social media and in email exchanges amongst some members. No statement would otherwise have been released.

The Charity Commission definition of a serious incident is actually as follows: *The Commission requires charities to report serious incidents. A serious incident is an adverse event, whether actual or alleged, which results in or risks significant:*

- *loss of your charity's money or assets*
- *damage to your charity's property*
- *harm to your charity's work, beneficiaries or reputation*

The advice from the Association's lawyers was that the matter constituted a serious incident which should be reported. The Commission informs trustees that it expects them to report matters where their professional advisers recommend it. The Board decided that in all the circumstances it was appropriate to notify the Charities Commission. The Board's Audit Committee asked for a review to be carried out by the external auditors of the processes undertaken. The auditors have completed this and report that in their view the Board followed a sound process and undertook the decision in accordance with its duties and powers.

Question 29 – Jon Broome

Does the board think it is a good use of the Associations money to set aside £5000 for the Code of Professional Conduct procedure against an individual when the £51.35p, for a mix-up over expenses, was paid back within days of it being requested ?

The question does not include the correct facts or context of the situation.

APM has not set a provision for the matter or released any details of the costs.

Code of Professional Conduct procedures are potentially lengthy, time consuming and costly. This is common to all professional bodies. APM takes the conduct of its members seriously and this becomes all the more important as APM progresses as a Chartered body. It is equally important for individual members that Code of Professional Conduct procedures are undertaken carefully and robustly. It is necessary for APM to take the cost into consideration when balancing the relevant considerations.

Question 30 – Jon Broome

Can the board give a timeline which overlays (a) the notification of the serious incident report to the Charities Commission and any subsequent responses; (b) the date of any actions required by the APM's Code of Professional Conduct disciplinary procedure against the individual; (c) the two Extraordinary General meetings called and (d) the key dates for the election. What explanation can the board or CEO offer for (i) the delays in progressing the disciplinary procedure ? and (ii) the other 'co-incidences' in timing ?

The detail requested cannot be provided as APM will respect the confidentiality of the individuals, and ongoing procedures. The level of detail requested is not a matter for release or discussion at a general meeting.

It is not accepted that there have been delays in progressing the Code of Professional Conduct procedure. This is underway and has involved the identification and appointment of an independent assessor. All matters have been progressed in a timely fashion and suggestions as to an ulterior motive are denied.

Question 31 – Jon Broome

What specific clause of the Royal Charter & its Schedules or the APM's Regulations gives the board authority to bar a member from seeking election (who, at the time of writing & hence elections, has not been found guilty of anything), thereby denying members the right to vote in who they see fit? (Note : While the board has made it clear that they took legal advice on this, I believe the legal advice relates to a lack of an effective remedy for the member to take an action against the board, not to whether they should or shouldn't have done this in the first place.)

See the answer to question 4 for detail on the basis for the Board taking the decision.

The legal advice received by the Board was comprehensive and related to the issue at hand. Advice was not sought on possible remedies for the candidate as suggested by the question.

Question 32 – Russel Jamieson

Why does APM need a premium priced 0845 switchboard number? Will they kindly replace it with a standard cost or low cost number at the soonest opportunity?

When the 0845 number was set up, it presented the least cost option for our external callers at that time. It was never intended as an income generator for APM, and it is not an area where APM makes a profit. It is a business rate option, not premium rate. At that time, 0800 numbers were not free for mobile callers, who formed a significant proportion of APM callers.

Obviously things have moved on in the area of telephony, and we recognise that this area needs to be re-examined to find the most cost effective option for both APM and our callers. This will be taken forward.

Question 33 – Adrian Pyne

Given the large number of people who have taken Agile Project Management certifications, e.g. over 55,000 people have taken AgilePM® since its launch 5 years ago, why has the Board and the APM executive consistently ignored this significant revenue opportunity and service to our members, while making considerable investment in other, far less successful qualifications?

APM's new strategy recognises the need to diversify its influence in the profession and reflect the growing interest in delivering projects with agility.

In 2017, APM held an Agile Summit with its corporate and government partners, published a report reflecting the themes of the summit, funded research into the scalability of agile, created a dedicated resource area on the APM website, covered the subject in *Project* journal and published a guide to agile assurance which complements existing advice on agile governance.

APM also investigated the impact of agile working practices on a future revision of the APM Competence Framework. Before the end of the financial year it will launch a pilot LinkedIn 'hub' for project professionals working in agile environments.

Overwhelming feedback from the Corporate Partners who attended the Agile Summit in July was the need to de-mystify the subject rather than to commodify specific agile methods and practices through additional qualifications and other products via APM.

It is APM's current view, therefore, that the profession is well served with these knowledge-based certifications focussing on specific agile methods such as the one referenced in the question. APM

would not add significant value to the profession by following the trend into an already crowded and fragmented market.

Instead, its focus continues to be on providing independent, relevant guidance, examples of good practice and evidence of its effectiveness as well as set standards of professional competence to ensure that these project methods are implemented to the greatest benefit. Rather than view agile as a separate paradigm in the profession, with a separate product set, APM views agile as an extension of current and emerging professional practice, a view strongly endorsed by corporate and government partners, and practitioners in the area.

In practice, this means providing further advice, guidance and research into agile approaches and its effectiveness. We will ensure that the upcoming revision of the APM Body of Knowledge reflects all emerging trends and that these are subsequently reflected in APM's qualification syllabuses. Also, that the APM Competence Framework is similarly updated and that the Chartered standard is accessible to those working at the appropriate level in all project environments. Through this, we can provide clear and recognisable career paths and professional standards to those working in the widest possible range of project environments.

Ends